Technical Management Team 10 November 2004

**Effects of Transport History on Performance on Adult Salmonid Migrants.** 

Chris Peery
Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83844-1141



#### **Background**

From 2000 to 2003, we radio-tagged

457 Snake River spring/summer Chinook Salmon and

727 Snake Rive steelhead.

60% of Chinook salmon had been barged

62% of steelhead had been barged

Known-source fish were monitored to determine homing, straying, survival and fallback for barged in in-river migrants.

# **Homing**

Chinook salmon – About 10% lower homing rate for transported fish.

		Percent (n) that homed				
Group by:	Year	River	Barge	$\chi^2$	P	
Chinook salmon						
All fish	All	92.6 (161)	82.5 (245)	8.5	0.004	
Adult return	2000	75.0 (8)	64.3 (14)	0.3	0.604	
	2001	93.8 (81)	83.4 (151)	5.0	0.025	
	2002	95.2 (42)	82.5 (40)	3.4	0.065	
	2003	90.0 (30)	85.0 (40)	0.4	0.536	
Outmigration	1998	85.7 (14)	63.2 (19)	2.1	0.151	
	1999	94.1 (85)	82.2 (163)	6.7	0.010	
	2000	91.9 (62)	92.5 (40)	0.0	0.918	
	2001		82.6 (23)			
Fin clipped	All	90.6 (53)	80.3 (117)	2.8	0.096	
No clips	All	93.5 (108)	84.4 (128)	4.8	0.028	

# **Homing**

Steelhead – Generally less effect than for Chinook salmon, except 2003.

		Percent (n) that homed					
Group by:	Year	River	Barge	$\chi^2$	P		
<b>Steelhead</b>							
All fish	All	88.7 (238)	75.6 (409)	16.4	< 0.001		
Adult return	2001	89.3 (112)	72.7 (154)	11.0	< 0.001		
	2002	87.3 (110)	79.1 (201)	3.2	0.073		
	2003	93.8 (16)	70.4 (54)	3.7	0.055		
Outmigration	1999	83.3 (36)	75.4 (61) 0.8		0.360		
	2000	89.3 (186)	78.8 (226)	8.1	0.004		
	2001		70.1 (87)				
	2002	93.8 (16)	68.6 (35)	3.9	0.049		
Fin clipped	All	87.1 (70)	79.7 (59)	1.3	0.252		
No clips	All	89.3 (168)	74.9 (350)	14.5	<0.001		

### **Fallback**

Barged Chinook salmon fell back more and more often than in-river migrants.

		Percent (n) that fell back				Fallback frequency			
Group by:	Year	River	Barge	$\chi^2$	Р	River	Barge	ttest P	
Chinook salmon									
All fish	All	7.5 (161)	19.2 (245)	10.8	0.001	1.1 (12)	2.7 (47)	0.015	
Adult return	2000	25.0 (8)	50.0 (14)	1.3	0.251	1.0(2)	3.1 (7)		
	2001	2.5 (81)	15.2 (151)	8.9	0.003	1.0 (2)	3.1 (23)		
	2002	14.3 (42)	25.0 (40)	1.5	0.221	1.0 (6)	2.5 (10)	0.085	
	2003	6.7 (30)	17.5 (40)	1.8	0.180	1.5 (2)	1.1 (7)		
Outmigration	1998	21.4 (14)	36.8 (19)	0.9	0.341	1.0 (3)	3.1 (7)		
	1999	1.2 (85)	17.2 (163)	13.9	< 0.001	1.0(1)	3.2 (28)		
	2000	12.9 (62)	20.0 (40)	0.9	0.336	1.1 (8)	1.4 (8)	0.278	
	2001		17.4 (23)				1.0 (4)		
Fin clipped	All	3.8 (53)	18.0 (117)	6.3	0.012	1.0 (2)	3.8 (21)		
No clips	All	9.3 (108)	20.3 (128)	5.5	0.019	1.1 (10)	1.8 (26)	0.137	

### **Fallback**

Steelhead – similar pattern as Chinook salmon, effect not as strong.

		Percent (n) that fell back				Fallback frequency			
Group by:	Year	River	Barge	$\chi^2$	P	River	Barge	ttest P	
Steelhead									
All fish	All	10.5 (238)	18.1 (409)	6.7	0.010	1.2 (25)	2.1 (74)	0.003	
Adult return	2001	8.9 (112)	18.8 (154)	5.1	0.024	1.2 (10)	2.1 (29)	0.050	
	2002	12.7 (110)	13.4 (201)	0.0	0.860	1.1 (14)	1.6 (27)	0.129	
	2003	6.3 (16)	33.3 (54)	4.6	0.032	1.0(1)	2.8 (18)		
Outmigration	1999	11.1 (36)	14.8 (61)	0.3	0.661	1.0 (4)	1.7 (9)		
	2000	10.8 (186)	15.5 (226)	2.0	0.160	1.2 (20)	1.9 (35)	0.031	
	2001		20.7 (87)				2.3 (18)		
	2002	6.3 (16)	34.3 (35)	4.5	0.033	1.0(1)	2.8 (12)		
Fin clipped	All	14.3 (70)	13.6 (59)	0.0	0.906	1.1 (10)	2.3 (8)	0.047	
No clips	All	8.9 (168)	18.9 (350)	8.5	0.004	1.2 (15)	2.1 (66)	0.032	

#### **Summary**

During low flow years and when spill reduced, proportion of fish transported will increase.

Fish that were barged as juveniles had lower survival to natal areas, likely because of greater straying and fallback behavior.

Evidence related specifically to 2001 outmigration year not complete.

Most PIT tagged fish were transported; no in-river comparison group.

2004 data not yet complete and less coverage than in past years.